1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA
3	
4	
5	
6	In re: ) Civil 05-MD-1708 (DWF/AJB)
7	GUIDANT CORPORATION ) STATUS CONFERENCE IMPLANTABLE DEFIBRILLATOR ) PRODUCTS LIABILITY )
8	LITIGATION, )
9	)
10	This Document Relates ) To All Actions ) 9:30 o'clock, a.m.
11	) June 21, 2006 ) Minneapolis, Minnesota
12	, Millicapolis, Millicsoca
13	
14	
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN W. FRANK AND
16	
17	THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE ARTHUR J. BOYLAN
18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE AND MAGISTRATE JUDGE
19	CIVIL STATUS CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
20	
21	
22	* * *
23	
24	JEANNE M. ANDERSON Registered Merit Reporter
25	Suite 646, 316 North Robert Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
	(651) 848-1221

1	APPEARANCES:		
2			
3	LEAD PLAINTIFF COUNSEL:		
4			
5		endy Fleishman, Esq. ieff, Cabraser, Heimann	
6		Berstein, LLP 75 Battery Street, 30th Floor	
7		an Francisco, CA 94111-3339 415) 956-1000	
8			
9	And		
10		eth R. Lesser, Esq.	
11	1:	ocks Law Firm, PLLC 10 East 55th Street	
12		ew York, NY 10022 212) 838-3333	
13			
14	And		
15		harles S. Zimmerman, Esq.	
16	6.5	immerman Reed 51 Nicollet Mall, Suite 501	
17		inneapolis, MN 55402-4123 612) 341-0400	
18			
19			
20	PLAINTIFF LIAISON COUNSEI	[.:	
21			
22	Z	harles S. Zimmerman, Esq. immerman Reed	
23	M:	51 Nicollet Mall, Suite 501 inneapolis, MN 55402-4123	
24		612) 341-0400	
25			

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):		
2			
3	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:	Ronald Goldser, Esq.	
4		Robert R. Hopper, Esq. Zimmerman Reed	
5		651 Nicollet Mall, Suite 501 Minneapolis, MN 55402-4123	
6		(612) 341-0400	
7	And		
8	11110		
9		Gale D. Pearson, Esq. Pearson, Randall & Schumacher, PA	
10		400 S. 4th Street, Suite 1012 Minneapolis, MN 55415	
11		(612) 332-0351	
12	And		
13	71114		
14		Silvija A. Strikis, Esq. Kellogg, Huber, Hansen	
15		Todd, Evans & Figel, PLLC Sumner Square	
16		1615 M Street, N.W. Suite 400	
17		Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 326-7939	
18		(202) 320 7939	
19	And		
20	Allu		
21		Daniel E Dognal In Egg	
22		Daniel E. Becnel, Jr., Esq. The Law Offices of	
23		Daniel E. Becnel, Jr. 106 W. 7th Street	
24		P.O. Drawer H Reserve, LA 70084	
25		(985) 536-1186	

1	APPEARANCES (Continued	) :
2		
3	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:	Lauren Cuth Barnes Ess
4	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS.	Lauren Guth Barnes, Esq. Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP Attorneys at Law
5		One Main Street, Fourth Floor Cambridge, MA 02142
6		(617) 482-3700
7		
8	And	
9		Joseph Crosby, Esq.
10		Crosby Law Office 952 Grand Avenue
11		St. Paul, MN 55116 (651) 225-1860
12		
13	And	
14		
15		Teresa C. Toriseva, Esq.
16		Hill, Toriseva & Williams, PLLC 89 Twelfth Street
17		Wheeling, West Virginia 19103
18		
19	And	
20		Neil Overholtz, Esq.
21		4400 Bayou Boulevard Suite 58
22		Pensacola, FL 32503-2673 (850) 916-7450
23		
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	And	
د⊿	And	

1	1 APPEARANCES (Continued):	
2	2	
3		las J. Drakulich, Esq. ngs & Drakulich LLP
4		Jimmy Durante Boulevard
5	5 Del M	ar, California 92014 755-5887
6		,33 3007
7	7	
8	8 And	
9		o K. Salas, III, Esq.
10	0 Salas	& Company, L.C. Post Oak Boulevard
11	1 Suite	2500 on, Texas 77056
12		609-9317
13	3	
14	4	
15	5	
16	6	
17	7	
18	8	
19	9	
20	0	
21	1	
22	2	
23	3	
24	4	
25	5	

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):	
2		
3	LEAD DEFENDANT COUNSEL:	
4	Wimphles A Death Har	
5	Timothy A. Pratt, Esq. Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP 2555 Grand Boulevard	
6	2555 Grand Boulevard Kansas City, MO 64108-6550 (816) 474-6550	
7	(010) 4/4-0220	
8		
9	LIAISON DEFENDANT COUNSEL:	
10		
11	Joseph M. Price, Esq.	
12	Faegre & Benson 2200 Wells Fargo Center	
13	90 South 7th Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3901	
14	(612) 766-7000	
15		
16	* * *	
17		
18		
19	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	
20	Deborah Moeller, Esq.	
21 22	Andrew D. Carpenter, Esq. Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP 2555 Grand Boulevard	
22	2555 Grand Boulevard Kansas City, MO 64108-6550 (816) 474-6550	
23 24	(010) 4/4-0220	
2 <del>4</del> 25		
ر ک		

```
1
                (In open court.)
2
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Thank you.
                                                         You
    may all be seated.
3
 4
                We welcome you again to beautiful Downtown
    Minneapolis, or whatever other description you may
5
6
    choose to attribute to it.
7
                Why don't I first have Plaintiffs and
    Defendants, respectively, note their presence today, and
8
    then we will proceed?
9
10
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: Good morning, Your Honor, I
    am Charles Zimmerman appearing on behalf of the
11
12
    Plaintiffs Steering Committee.
13
                MR. LESSER: Good morning, Your Honor, Seth
    Lesser on behalf of the Plaintiffs.
14
15
                MR. HOPPER: Good morning, Your Honor, Randy
16
    Hopper on behalf of the Plaintiffs.
17
                MS. FLEISHMAN: Wendy Fleishman on behalf of
    the Plaintiffs.
18
19
                MS. STRIKIS: Cindy Strikis, on behalf of the
20
    Plaintiffs.
                MR. BECNEL: Daniel Becnel. I think we
21
22
    termed your city, the Paris of the North.
23
                MR. SALAS: Good morning, Your Honor, Camilo
24
    Salas on behalf of the Plaintiffs.
25
```

MS. PEARSON: Good morning, Your Honor, Gale

```
Pearson on behalf of the State Court Plaintiffs.
1
2
                MS. TORISEVA: Good morning, Teresa Toriseva
    on behalf of the Plaintiffs.
3
 4
                MS. BARNES: Lauren Barnes on behalf of the
    Plaintiffs.
5
6
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Anybody else care
7
    to introduce themselves? I don't know if we are divided
    or demarcated by parties. All right?
8
                MR. DRAKULICH: Nicholas Drakulich on behalf
9
    of the Plaintiffs, Your Honor.
10
11
                MR. SHELMAN: Hunter Shelman (PH) on behalf
    of the Plaintiffs.
12
13
                MR. GOLDSER: I guess you will meet us all,
    Your Honor, Ron Goldser on behalf of the Plaintiffs.
14
15
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Fair enough.
16
                MR. OVERHOLTZ: Neil Overholtz on behalf of
    the Plaintiffs.
17
                MR. RICHARDS: Keith Richards on behalf of
18
19
    the Plaintiffs.
20
                MR. HOPPER: This is our paralegal, Your
21
    Honor.
22
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Mr. Pratt, do you
23
    want to begin with the Defense?
24
                MR. PRATT: Tim Pratt for Guidant.
25
                MS. MOELLER: Debbie Moeller for the
```

Defendant. 1 2 MR. CARPENTER: Andrew Carpenter for the Defendants. 3 4 MR. PRICE: Joe Price for Defendants, Your Mr. Becnel has never been to St. Paul, which is 5 really the Paris of the North. 6 7 MR. BECNEL: Oh, I have. And I have to go there on Viagra in about two hours. 8 9 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Well, that is a personal 10 problem. 11 (Laughter.) 12 MR. ZIMMERMAN: We like to sprinkle humor 13 into the courtroom, Your Honor. THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: I will note for 14 the record that, for everyone in the courtroom, 15 16 consistent with the prior meetings of counsel for each Plaintiff and Defendant, we did meet as scheduled from 17 18 8:00 until 9:15 this morning. 19 And there is a joint agenda that was posted 20 on our court website. But, we will go through those 21 item by item. Maybe, without trying to get off the 22 agenda, I will just note there has been requests, as the 23 lawyers for the respective parties know, we get requests 24 from time to time to appear by telephone from individual 25 Plaintiffs. And the policy of the Court has been and

will continue to be that, generally, what we tell to individual Plaintiffs' counsel from around the country, the requests that came in this week happened to be for a case new to the MDL, that they should contact first of all plaintiffs' Counsel Committee. And then if there is -- whether there is agreement or not, if there is a compelling reason why something has to be brought to the Court's attention in the interests of fairness to a party or to minimize hardship, we will take it up on a case-by-case basis, but will not be, for a variety of reasons, many of which I will articulate, if asked to, the having this an open phone line, realizing that some judges, both MDL and non-MDL, do that. In part, because we roll the transcript out on to the website. But, we will take them up on a case-by-case basis and that is a general guideline. And there may be a compelling circumstance, because we have the technology, that is not the issue. It is more in the interests of fairness, decorum, control, and a good record.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

And if from my point of view or our point of view, if we step off the curb, unless there is a compelling case, and there may well be from time to time where fairness dictates somebody be heard for the record without having somebody come in here for a minute or two presentation, we must be prepared to do it for large

numbers of people. Until there is some compelling reason that sends us that way, that is kind of the approach we have been taking when we get the individual requests.

And I say it in part today, and I think many here knew that, but now for others new to the case, as the transcript rolls up on the website, they can see that we will direct people initially to the committee, and then we will go from there.

With that interruption, we can leave at the end the scheduling issues for the phone conference and the next status conference. But, we might as well begin, Mr. Zimmerman, if you wish?

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Did you have anything else?

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: No.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: The first item on the agenda, Your Honor, is the number and status of cases transferred into the MDL Court. And I guess embedded in that is also the question of cases that are outside in State Courts, and the coordination that has occurred in Minnesota.

Recently, I have learned that an Order was signed by the Chief Judge of the Minnesota Supreme Court

to coordinate all of the state cases in Minnesota before Judge Leary in Ramsey County. That was not on the agenda as a particular item, but we learned that recently and I just wanted to inform the Court and counsel here that the State Court proceedings have now all been coordinated and consolidated before one judge in Ramsey County.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And if I may, I have not talked to Judge Leary since that Order, but the Judge that I have communicated with the most, me with him and he has initiated contact with me, is in fact Judge Leary from Ramsey County.

And so, I am just going to indicate for the record while he has got his job to do and we have got our job to do, every indication that I have is that we probably agree on the value of coordination and trying to move forward without compromising the interests of his cases or ours. And so, it should mean for all parties in this case, that should be good news, in my judgment, based on my contacts with the Judge.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: And I know Gale Pearson is here, who has been representing, or speaking on behalf of the State Court cases. I don't know if you have any status on the numbers or anything you wanted to say about the cases that have been consolidated, but you

certainly can come forward.

MS. PEARSON: No, I think we are doing fine.

Thank you. Excuse me, if the Court has any questions, I
can answer them specifically. Otherwise --

I just said to Judge Leary and he said the same thing to us -- and I don't think it is really remarkable, particularly, it is quite consistent with cases across the country. That if there comes a time, sooner or later, where there is some value in us getting together, the three of us, for whatever reason, with counsel or some joint session, there may or may not come such a time, such things have occurred in other cases. We have just expressed our willingness to do that and he has done the same. That may or may not become necessary.

And obviously, we will both disclose to counsel in both sets of cases any contact that we have. So, I think as long as the communication lines are open, that can only benefit all of the parties. So --

MR. ZIMMERMAN: And we understand, as the Plaintiff's Steering Committee, the importance of State and Federal coordination. Dawn Barrios from Louisiana is doing the State and Federal coordination efforts, as well in other states, as Gale Pearson is doing in Minnesota. And we recognize the value of it.

We will see where it goes. As problems or issues develop, we will deal with them. We don't know of any at this particular period of time. But, we appreciate the openness with which the Court is dealing with that issue because it is often a tricky wick in complicated proceedings where there are cases in both State and Federal Court.

And the question of transferred cases into the MDL and number and status of the cases, I think Mr. Pratt has better information than I, but the most recent information I have may not be the most relevant -- or, I mean, the most recent, so we will let Tim go forward on that issue.

MR. PRATT: Yeah, we have actually have a number of new case filings very recently in Federal Court. The total number of cases we now have in Federal Courts are 437. And they fall into three different buckets, as they always do. How many are here, presently? You have 333 lodged in the MDL at the current time. You have 48 of them that are pending before the Panel under official tag-along sort of conditional transfer orders and then the rest of them are recently enough filed that they are yet to be tagged along in front of the Judicial Panel.

So, the total of 437 in Federal Court, 333

here, for all purposes, consistent with the MDL orders. We have 46 State Court cases, which means that the new case filings have predominantly been directly into Federal Court.

I believe, and Gale may have more recent information than I, that we have about a dozen state court cases in Minnesota that have been consolidated before Judge Leary. So, we will be moving ahead on that, those consolidated cases. This is the only state where there has been consolidation. Actually, I think the highest number of cases pending in any other state is five or six in Texas, so they are pretty widely disbursed around the country. So, that is, I think, the current layout of the number and types of cases.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Thank you. If I may, something that came up at the conference this morning that I raised and you can have a seat if you like, Mr. Pratt.

MR. PRATT: Fine.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: We have a doctrine in most districts, the related case doctrine. It is an administrative doctrine, not a legal doctrine, of the case that come in, and then between the lawyers and ultimately the judge or judges, they decide if cases are related, which I say is an administrative doctrine

for case management, to decide, well, is there prudence in one judge managing the cases? It is a bit different, of course, when it is an MDL.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Recently, and I only bring it up because it probably will come up in the future and we will deal with them on an individual basis. A case came in, and it was out of the device Ventak Prizm VR Model 1850. And it was individually assigned to another judge. And I wasn't the Judge who randomly drew the case. decision has been made by Judge Doty and myself that it is a related case. And the lawyer has been so informed. And one of the Plaintiffs' Counsel today indicated that he had talked with him. But, as these come in, that may be an issue. But, the related case doctrine, sometimes lawyers from afar looking at it, it is an administrative rule of case management, principle of most districts of just way they manage the cases. But, as they come in we will look at that. We deem this one part of the MDL case. But, any correspondence that we individually have with any individual lawyers that take the position -because we have been asked to reconsider that decision, we agreed this morning that we will copy in counsel on both sides so that everyone is kept aware that there are certain individuals who have filed a Federal Court action but suggested that they are unrelated because of

a particular device. We have concluded otherwise. But, we will keep everybody informed. We can move on.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you. I just want to state for the record that the short form check-off complaint has been approved by the Court. I believe it is available now. So people who have been not filing or waiting the simplified filing through the short form process, it is up, running and available and that may or may not, probably impact these numbers going forward.

The next issue, Your Honors, is the discovery status. It breaks down into status of depositions and deposition concerns. Normally Richard Arsenault makes this report. He was not able to make it here because of some flight complications out of Louisiana. But, I think it is fair to say that the depositions are moving rapidly and approximately 19 have been completed, I believe is the number.

MS. MOELLER: Noticed.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: I'm sorry, noticed. There are probably five or six that we have discussed with the Court this morning. We are awaiting direction from the Court on whether those five or six additional ones will be available.

And these are all going to be completed before any preemption motion is responded to by the PSC.

A motion for preemption has been filed by the Defense.

And as we spoke with the Court this morning, we are going to complete the discovery, and then two weeks after the completion of the discovery, the PSC will file their reply or response.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And actually, Judge Boylan will give you the ruling, but one reason for us late coming in here, we had a chance to discuss it. And we will make a ruling today on that issue.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Okay.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: We might as well make the ruling right now. The depositions, all five, will be completed, including Arrowsmith-Lowe and DeVries. The depositions should be completed on or before August 15th.

Presuming that those depositions are completed by August 15, as ordered, the Plaintiffs' response on the Defense motion relative to preemption issues will be served and filed on or before September 1st. The Defendant's reply will be due on or before September 15th.

Counsel should contact Judge Frank's chambers probably immediately, for that matter, to obtain a date for a hearing on the preemption issue and the place where that may take place. It may take place, I guess

it is up to you, Judge, whether it is in St. Paul or here in Minneapolis, but counsel are directed to contact his chambers.

In reference to the expert depos, I'm assuming there is going to be a meet and confer in reference to appropriate protocol. And absent some disagreement, the parties will stipulate and be able to agree on such a protocol.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And then I would like you all to get back to us. It doesn't need to be today, on knowing what this is. If it is the sense of the group to set the oral argument for the motion on the same day that coincides to when we're together, so that other people can observe, fine.

If it is the sense of the group that that should be done some other time for whatever reasons, I will try to accommodate that. And I will just indicate something that many of the lawyers in the room already know. This whole schedule, really apart from some of the nuances of the ruling here is not holding up or delaying anything.

So, if anybody is saying, is this having any effect on the existing deadlines and the schedule, it is not. It was all anticipated and it is all set up. It may not be going exactly as individuals wanted, but it

is going along, I think, essentially as planned. 1 2 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Just so I could make sure I understand and the record is clear if anybody is going 3 4 to read the transcript, that the completion of the discovery that the Court has just ordered of, I think, 5 an additional five depositions --6 7 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: There were five depositions, but as I understood it, three of 8 those were uncontested --9 10 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Correct. 11 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: 12 were contested. I am presuming all five will be 13 completed by August 15, including the two that were contested, which is DeVries and Loel. 14 15 MR. ZIMMERMAN: I stand corrected, that is 16 absolutely how I understood it. It may not have come 17 out that way, but that is how I understood it. 18 And then the brief of the Plaintiffs Steering 19 Committee on the issue of preemption will be due 20 September 1. 21 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: 22 Correct. 23 MR. ZIMMERMAN: The reply brief will be due 24 from the Defense on September 15th. 25 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN:

```
1
    Correct.
2
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: And both of us are asked to
3
    contact Mr. Lowell Lundquist -- is it Lundquist?
 4
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Lindquist, as in
    Leonard Lindquist.
5
6
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: Leonard Lindquist.
    remember Leonard very well, Leonard and Lowell. And
7
8
    then --
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Lowell, you
9
10
    haven't been in C.J.'s column, so --
11
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: You might if you keep this
12
    up.
13
                THE CLERK:
                            Thank you, Judge.
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: We will contact the chambers
14
    to have a hearing date. Is there any direction from the
15
16
    Court as to how long after September 15th you --
17
                THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN:
18
    think you should contact the chambers immediately, given
19
    the fact that you know what the briefing schedule is,
20
    there is no reason you can't obtain a date for a
21
    hearing.
22
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: We will give you
23
    a day.
                THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN:
24
                                                         I am
25
    sure the Judge will want to have several weeks between
```

```
1
    the completion of the briefing and the hearing to review
2
    the briefs. But, I think on or after October 1st --
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Yeah, the issue
 3
4
    will really be, as I mentioned a moment ago, if the
    sense of the group is for whatever reasons you would
5
    like to coordinate it with when we are here together, we
6
7
    will make that work. If the sense of the group is -- we
    have done that in one other case. We started late in
8
    the morning on the prior set of motions I heard.
9
10
                If the sense of the group is, for whatever
    reasons, well, we want to do it on a different date, I
11
12
    will accommodate either. And we can give you a date as
13
    soon as today, if you want it.
                               Yeah, we might as well get it
14
                MR. ZIMMERMAN:
    by the time we leave today, and then everyone will know.
15
16
    I think it is the kind of hearing people may want to
17
    come in for. I think it is probably not, in my
18
    judgment, a special hearing, but --
19
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: We can talk about
20
    that as long as -- you folks can meet and confer and
21
    then we will come up with a --
22
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: We will talk about that.
23
                The status of the production of documents and
24
    the 18 --
                MR. PRATT:
25
                            Excuse me.
                                         If we could spend
```

just a second on the status of depositions, Ms. Moeller has got some -- I though it would be helpful to give the Court a sense of where we are and what we are doing in terms of the individual depositions.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Fair enough.

MS. MOELLER: Since the last status conference, we completed or begun the depositions of Dan Tich, manager of reliability and quality assurance, Scott Olson, who is a 30(b)6 marketing witness, Allan Gorsett, former vice-president of quality assurance and reliability, completed the 30(b)6 deposition of Randy Nuernberg, who was on the topic of medical advisories and recalls, and completed the 30(b)6 deposition on Chris Harrold on the subject limited to 1861's, by the prior stipulation with the Court. And also to Todd Koning, the 30(b)6 on warranties.

We have scheduled within the upcoming months several more depositions and are working on others. We have been in discussions with the Plaintiffs' counsel about the duplicative nature of some of their requests, and so they have agreed to pull some notices down pending notice depositions to see if we can come to some agreement on those issue without coming back here.

We are running into issues with -- and I think Mr. Carpenter will be addressing this more on the

subject of documents. We have had some depositions that have been scheduled that have had to be pulled down because of questions about the completeness of discovery that has been submitted, which is putting some things off. And I believe that they have now noticed from our perspective all of the 29 company reps and third parties that they are entitled to under the current deposition protocol and completed all of the five 30(b)6 witness depositions, with the exception of the continuation of Mr. Harrold's deposition that we are also allowed under the deposition protocol.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Our only response is we are certainly trying to work these out. We don't want any duplicative depositions. We are not interested in that. We are interested in the facts and what happened. And we will work it out.

The status of production of documents on 1861 and other devices, what we have requested from the Defense is that we have a certification that that production is complete. I think that is sort of where we were in chambers. And we are just waiting for the Defense to provide us with this notion that -- the notice that that discovery has been tendered and is complete. The idea there is we don't want to have documents coming in at the tail end, or documents

filtering in later that says, oh, we forgot, these should have been produced. And we are working with them on that and I think that will be forthcoming.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We just tickle that as an issue. If it doesn't happen, we will bring that before the Court.

But, we expect it will happen and it won't be an issue at all.

I don't know if there is anything else on documents, but Defense may have something.

MR. PRATT: I do want to say -- you know, Mr. Carpenter is going to address this. We have been working, I think, very well with the Plaintiffs Steering Committee. I mean, I have been involved in these things, and I think that we have reached agreements on lots of things. And I think Your Honors could attest to the fact that this MDL is going fairly smoothly without too much judicial involvement. And part of it is I remember a telephone conference with Judge Boylan when he barked at us for, you know, you've got to get along and stop taking these petty squabbles to the Court's attention. So, I think we took that to heart, and I think we have actually worked out most of these agreements.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: I think you are misquoting me.

26 1 MR. PRATT: I don't know if the word petty 2 was used. THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: 3 Ι 4 think it qualified as a bark. MR. PRATT: And we are all working it out. 5 We are reaching the point where we got lots of 6 7 depositions noticed, we are trying to get them ready. 8 They want documents and they are entitled to documents. We are trying to get them to them. I think that dialog, 9 10 the weekly conference calls have been working well in that regard. But, Mr. Carpenter, if you could address 11 12 maybe the item 2B, please? 13 MR. CARPENTER: Just briefly, Your Honors, to amplify what Mr. Zimmerman and Mr. Pratt said. 14 15 that document production is going efficiently and well. 16

We think To date we have produced over 6.4 million pages of documents in this litigation.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Next week we are scheduled to produce another approximately two million more pages of documents, but it's close to eight and a half million pages so far, which in comparison to most other MDL's is an extremely fast pace.

We are also working with the Plaintiffs Steering Committee to make sure that we are trying to focus on the issues, and producing the documents that are most useful in the priorities that Plaintiffs want us to do them. We meet at least once a week, sometimes twice a week to discuss these ongoing issues.

Right now we are primarily focusing on identifying and making sure we produce all of the documents that are relevant to the particular company witnesses that the Plaintiffs have noticed for deposition.

We are also focusing on expediting any relevant documents agreed to produce pursuant to the Defendant's fact sheet that apply to specific bellwether Plaintiffs, so we have those as quickly as possible.

We will work and continue to work with the Plaintiffs Steering Committee on making sure to produce all of the documents for these witnesses that we can reasonably be sure of.

It is a massive undertaking. We go through enormous efforts to make sure we've got all of the documents. There is always the chance that a few -- we uncover certain dates, and we always have technical issues with certain problem documents that are hard to recognize, require reprocessing and reprocessing and reprocessing. These technical challenges are things that we are dealing with on an ongoing basis. But, we will work, and we should be in a position that we can

certify to a reasonable certainty to all reasonable measures that we think we have got all of the relevant documents for these witnesses.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Thank you.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Privilege and redaction issues. It says we have a motion pending, two motions pending. I believe that we agreed that those were going to be heard at the next status, is that correct?

Defendants want to brief it, and I don't understand why, but they do.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And I think again for the rest of the folks in the room, I think it was the consensus of the group that that is not going to --nothing has been put on hold. I mean, because, obviously, if there was a strong view from either side of the aisle that, well, if the Court would agree to hear it sooner then the next conference which we will set before we are done here, we would do that. But, I think we have an agreement that it is not going to slow anything else down. We will get to it and make a ruling on it. All right?

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Very good. Then the last issue under discovery, Your Honor, is the bellwether Plaintiff fact sheet issues. I guess that is really a Defense issue. It is a massive undertaking and we know

there are technical challenges, but we will do our best. Those were your words, Andy.

MR. PRATT: Yeah, Mr. Carpenter, I think, is more involved in that massive undertaking, eight and a half million pages. We know massive, but we are -- we are moving ahead with depositions of individual bellwether Plaintiffs. We have started that process. They are scheduled, but we do have, you know, it sounds like a refrain, but some issues over the adequacy even of the bellwether Plaintiffs of the fact sheets and the authorizations, so -- Mr. Carpenter, you can address that.

MR. CARPENTER: Sure. And as the Court knows, this is an issue we have touched on before. On the one hand, I am really encouraged. We are moving forward with depositions of bellwether Plaintiffs. We started taking some last week, took some more -- we are in the process of taking more this week. We have at least half of them with good firm notice dates and scheduled up. And we are optimistic that we are going to be able to get these done.

At the same time, part of our challenge is to make sure that we have got the documents and the records that we need to be able to accurately and fully depose these bellwether Plaintiffs.

```
We don't want to have to come back to these
1
2
    people and make them sit again for another deposition,
    and yet at the same time we want to make sure we have
3
 4
    got all of the information. I appreciate Mr.
    Zimmerman's position. It is a massive undertaking with
5
6
    technical issues on both sides of the aisle on this
7
    issue.
8
                I think it might be useful, and I can go into
    as much or as little detail as is useful for the Court
9
10
    or anyone else here to discuss some of the problems we
11
    are having with some of the bellwether Plaintiffs,
    Plaintiff fact sheets and authorizations, which are
12
13
    really emblematic of the same kinds of problems that we
    have with the larger group of cases. Because obviously
14
15
    we have to move forward quickly with these depositions,
16
    they are more acute. There are some categories of
    problems we have.
17
                There are some bellwether cases where we
18
19
    still don't have any authorizations.
2.0
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Why is that, Mr.
21
    Zimmerman, or whoever wants to be heard?
22
                                I can actually respond to
                MS. FLEISHMAN:
23
    that, if I may.
24
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Why is that?
25
                MS. FLEISHMAN: I think that what we need to
```

-- I'm sorry, Wendy Fleishman, I apologize. I think that we need to work with Mr. Carpenter and find out exactly who the Plaintiffs are of the bellwether subset that haven't supplied any authorization.

I suspect that -- my suspicion is, at least, that the ones that there are no authorizations for are the ones that the Plaintiffs were going to stipulate to withdraw as Plaintiffs and withdraw their cases entirely. And that that is really what the problem is. And we just need to sit and talk about that and figure that out, which is the same issue we raised in chambers with regard to the authorizations and Plaintiff fact sheets that are still missing with respect to certain cases that were filed.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: Do I understand that you are going to be meeting and conferring this afternoon, perhaps, on some bellwether issues?

MS. FLEISHMAN: Tomorrow morning.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: Oh, tomorrow morning? And that might be one of the matters you are taking up?

MS. FLEISHMAN: Yes. I don't mean to cut you short, but we are also trying to meet and now get sort of a daily schedule out. So, if there are problems such

as a specific plaintiff, I think Mr. Harkonen, and the Plaintiffs -- or Defense were missing records for a seven-month period. We are trying to address that and get those records to them as quickly as possible, so that these problems are not brought to the Court's attention, and also won't stop the process whatsoever.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Should I be surprised or should we be surprised, if I understood you correctly, that with respect to the bellwether selection process there are cases that have been targeted as bellwether that may step off the MDL? I mean, it seems a bit late in the process, for both parties, to have that occurring.

MS. FLEISHMAN: The Plaintiffs, with respect to the Plaintiffs' bellwether set of 20, I don't expect that to happen. With respect to the selection that the Defendants made out of the 20, I do expect that to happen. Because I suspect that is also why the Defendants picked those.

I mean, as Your Honor knows, this is a preemptory strike process. And I think in any case that we pulled out in advance of the deposition, for reasons like authorizations, medical records or unavailability of the Plaintiff willing to go forward and be available for trial are all reasons that will count as one of our

preemptories or our strikes in the process.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, we can't resolve it here, but it just is also -- that I understand. I am a bit surprised that when a Plaintiff would have the ability to get to trial in March of next year, because that is what is going to happen, that they would walk away with no assurance of when, if ever, they are going to get the case somewhere else.

They are going to have to withdraw their case entirely.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right.

MS. FLEISHMAN: I don't think that this is -I think that the issue is that if they file a lawsuit,
they have to be ready, willing and able to go forward
with the lawsuit as expeditiously as possible, because
that is what is provided for under the Federal Rules,
and we have every intention of doing that.

maybe it is just my chitter-chatter, and that is probably all it is, but I actually think the criticism of some MDL cases is the inverse. In other words, there are plaintiffs standing at the door saying: Why not me? And so to hear some people say: Why me? Well, I guess that is what we have your committee for and we will do the best we can.

1 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Because they are picked by 2 someone else. I mean, that's -- theoretically the Defense --3 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: But, they filed 4 the lawsuit. Well, we will get them resolved. 5 MS. FLEISHMAN: They filed the lawsuit. Ιf 6 7 they are not ready to proceed with the lawsuit as 8 expeditiously as possible, that will indeed count as one of our strikes. 9 10 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Like we have all said together, both in written orders, and when we have 11 had our discussions, and here in this courtroom and 12 13 other courtrooms here, in the end, I mean, we have to make the call. Well, have the cases you have come up 14 with, are they representative? Because it they are not, 15 16 they are not going to do for everybody on either side 17 what we want them to do. Well, we are not there yet, so we will see what they look like when we get there 18 19 shortly. 2.0 All right? 21 MS. FLEISHMAN: All right. 22 MR. CARPENTER: Your Honor, just adding to 23 what Ms. Fleishman said, that process has already 24 somewhat begun. We have already had the dismissal of

one of the bellwethers. The Defendants picked the

25

Robinson case, which was allegedly a death case, a wrongful death case, and that has been voluntarily dismissed with prejudice. We expect more to follow.

I agree with a lot of what Ms. Fleishman said, I think some of the problems with authorizations, some of problems with fact sheets may stem from certain Plaintiffs who are probably not going to be willing to continue their cases and will end up being strikes.

Although, not to blindside Ms. Fleishman, but one of them is one of her cases from Liz Cabraser, the Furtado case. We still don't have authorizations in that case according to our last records.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, in fairness, we can put some responsibility right up here. I filed an order earlier in the week, or at the end of last week on some parameters on the authorizations.

So, it may be that someone was waiting to see, well, what is the Court going to say on the execution of some of these? So, that may or may not be part of it, but that order should have come out earlier than it did, but it was last week, to fine-tune some of that a bit. And it is up on the web if there are people saying what on earth is the Judge talking about. It went up last week, so -- all right?

MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, that is a very valid

point. That may be the cause of some of that, Your Honor.

2.0

In addition, though, we have got some other issues that are not explainable with that dynamic, such as there's a large number of bellwether cases in which they are still giving us only provider-specific limited authorizations in direct contravention of this Court's prior Order from, I think it was, May 19th. The Duron case, Hunt, Larson, Webb, Williams, Schacher, Martin, Addis, White, and all of those cases, we have nothing but provider specifically limited authorization.

In other bellwether cases, for instance, the Walston case the Plaintiffs have substituted their own set of authorizations for the Court-approved versions.

We have got a set in that case approved by the New York State Department of Health, which is not what this Court approved and not what the parties negotiated.

In other bellwether cases, Your Honor, the Plaintiffs simply refused to provide certain subsets of the authorizations. Sometime their mental health records, sometimes their mental health military records, sometimes it is just a general objection to providing any authorizations, quote, protected by State and Federal law, the Pritzker law firm objects on those. In cases like Brewster, Haberle, Lowry and Pepper, we

have counsel still declining to give the full set of authorizations ordered by the Court and negotiated by the parties. In other cases, some of the bellwether cases have probably innocently incorrectly filled the authorization forms out incorrectly to the point where they are unusable and we can't get proper medical records or other records from them, cases like Roberts, Newman, Harkonen and Morneau, there is a problem with the existing authorizations. Certain parts were filled out wrong and we just can't get the records we need.

In a lot of these cases, also, Your Honors, in addition to the authorizations issues, we have got outstanding deficiencies, several of these cases we sent deficiency letters as early as March and received no response or amendment whatsoever from a lot of these cases. Cases like Johnny Clark, Clasby, Curcio, Douglas, Kaminski, Martin, Addis and White, we have all got outstanding deficiency letters that we either have to have a response on and we have gotten none for, or we have gotten a very inadequate response.

Some of the Plaintiff fact sheets came in very recently, within the last month or so, and we are still reviewing those to see how complete they are.

Those cases include Fuller, Robert Smith and the Western case.

I can say that in several of the cases, though, we do have relatively complete Plaintiff fact sheets and proper authorizations. Those cases include Beranek, Bradshaw, Braund, Brennan, Brewer, Bultena, Pearl Clark, Fanzini, Lindemann, Poje, Rooker and Rebecca Smith. They are not perfect, Your Honors, but I think in those cases, they are relatively complete enough that we can proceed and take some meaningful depositions in all of those.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: You are getting into a lot of detail about complaints on medical authorizations. You are not asking us to do anything about that this morning, you are just giving us some information. Where does it go from here? You are meeting and conferring in reference to trying to pare down the list of bellwether cases. So, where is this going to go?

MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, that is the question. What do we do about it? We have been coordinating with the Plaintiffs Steering Committee trying to get some of these issues fixed. We appreciate the help they have been able to give us on some of that. But, some of the counsel, despite this Court's orders, the May 19th Order, for instance, making it clear you can't provider-specific limit the authorizations, some counsel

1 are just not complying. 2 We would like -- first of all, it helps to put on the record who is complying and who is not 3 4 complying. We are not delaying the depositions, obviously, although we are trying to back load later in 5 the month-long period the ones we lack medical records 6 7 for and prioritize the ones we are relatively complete for, or more complete for. 8 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: 9 These 10 are depositions of the 20 --11 MR. CARPENTER: The bellwether cases. 12 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: Or cases that the Plaintiffs identified? 13 14 MR. CARPENTER: Both, both. 15 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: And 16 your bellwether cases? 17 MR. CARPENTER: Yes, yes, the whole 40. We'd propose, or we would ask that the 18 19 Plaintiffs Steering Committee meet with, reach out to 20 these counsel in each of these cases and get these issues fixed within a week. 21 22 This dialogue has been ongoing for quite some 23 time. We realize a week isn't much time, but at the 24 same time, the depositions of bellwether Plaintiffs is

ongoing and we really need this information.

25

So, what we propose is the Steering Committee reach ought to these individual counsel and try to get these problems fixed, get proper authorizations, get the deficiencies fixed within a week of this date so we can continue and get meaningful depositions.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: Are you attempting to complete discovery of the medical records with the, at least in your view, unsatisfactory authorizations that you have in hand? I mean, you are taking a look at the authorization -- maybe you are not particularly happy with it, but you are going to obtain as many records as you can, given the authorization you have in hand?

MR. CARPENTER: Absolutely. We are not sitting back and waiting for perfect authorizations, we are moving to get everything we can with what we have.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: All right.

MS. FLEISHMAN: Might I just respond for a second? One second. First is that we have asked counsel to give us a list of the problems they are encountering in this process, and specifically as even last week. And they just raised three of the issues last week, which we addressed specifically in the interim and were able to solve.

And one, actually, they asked me to provide a deposition for one of my clients, and I even provided that. So, we are addressing all of these. And if they would sit with us and spend a little bit of time with us in going through each of these problems, which I expect we will do tomorrow, then I think we can address all of these as quickly as possible.

The second issue is that we have addressed a lot of the authorization problems, and I think we even brought the issue to the Court. There is an outstanding stipulation before the Court, and with this particular problem with the ten-year limitation highlighted for the Court's decision.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: I filed an order last week, so I think I took --

MS. FLEISHMAN: I'm sorry. We have the Order. And then we will get that out right away.

And then the third issue that was pointed out was that when the Defendants took, I think it is, Mr. Bradshaw's Deposition on the 16th, it is interesting, because they never even used any of these medical records.

All they used was the Plaintiffs fact sheet.

And as Mr. Carpenter pointed out to the Court, they have all of the material. So, we do want to move the process

along, and I think we will be able to do that. But, we just want to be forthright with the Court when we have problems.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN:
Simply because they have got the medical records and
they choose not to depose the Plaintiff on the records
they have in hand is neither here nor there. The
Court's Order was very clear that the type of
authorization that the Court expects the Plaintiffs to
provide to the Defense is crystal clear, and it should
not be limited, except as authorized by the Court.

And if in fact at the end of the day there are disagreements between Plaintiffs and Defendants about which are the bellwether cases, if the disagreement includes the complaint that some of the bellwether cases that Plaintiffs are promoting have not been forthright and compliant with the Court's Order about medical authorizations, that is going to have to be one of the things that the Court considers in determining whether or not to allow that to be a bellwether case or allow a different case to be a bellwether case. So, I mean, there are some consequences that flow from this that I think is really important. I know you are working on this, but my comments are to underscore the importance in complying

with the Court's Order and getting that squared away, because I think we have been really good about trying to set out a time frame.

It is realistic to get those bellwether cases teed up, but it requires a lot of cooperation from both sides that it be done. And if the cooperation is not there, there will be some consequences, it seems to me, from the failure to comply with the Court's Order and cooperate.

MS. FLEISHMAN: And that is useful, because then we can say that to counsel for the individual Plaintiffs, which we will do. But, we just need cooperation from the Defense, too, to tell us when they are having a problem. Because I don't want to come into the courtroom, Your Honors, the first time to hear about 26 problems when Mr. Carpenter has ready access on a 24-hour basis to me by blackberry, telephone and any other method one can think of by use of modern electronic communication.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: Yeah, and I understand you are going to be talking about it today and tomorrow, too.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, and it's particularly, just to echo a bit, most of -- two observations. One is, most of the ground work for these

medical authorizations were reached after negotiation and stipulation. And whether it was by Court decision, with some of the minor modifications, there is nothing alarming about these authorizations. I mean, if I compare them to a typical case in the Federal or State Court across the country, there is nothing unusual about them, other than the numbers. But, that should not effect individual Plaintiffs. Because I think, as Judge Boylan said, there is a bit at stake here, so we are going to stay on the timeline we have. But the potential consequence -- especially when you negotiated most of the terms. So --

2.0

MR. ZIMMERMAN: And we understand that totally, Your Honor. And I know you appreciate, we are dealing with counsel who are not here today who we have to communicate with who have their ways of doing things in their office that may be different than what is standard or practiced in the Federal Courts here or in other places, and we are working hard on it.

I think the only thing I would like to say is, we are here to meet and confer on these issues and discuss them. The laundry list, I think is, you know, for effect saying, you know, gosh, we have got a lot of work to do, the massive undertaking, the technical challenges, the good faith, I think you hear all that.

And we are working very hard on this and we hear the message of the Court very well.

2.0

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And if there is something we can do to move this along -- because I don't think we have closed our doors. So, I mean, if there is something we can do, rather than enable the problems to continue, but to resolve them -- I mean, we will do them, we are not saying we won't involve ourself if need be.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Right. But, we have a slightly different problem because we don't have a client who is paying our bill and doing it like a corporate defendant. We have a lot of people out there we have to communicate with and get them to do it the way we want it to be done. And there is a little bit of a struggle on that, but we are working hard on it.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Representative trial process update, Your Honor. I think we kind of conferred on that and I think we covered it. I don't know if the Court wants anything more. The more we talked about, the more we find we have too much to talk about.

Motions to dismiss for failure to file

Plaintiff fact sheets, I believe argument is going to be

set -- or is that going to be today?

```
1
                MR. CARPENTER: It was scheduled for today,
2
    but I don't believe -- I'm sorry, Your Honors -- we have
3
    officially entered the joint stipulated order. We are
4
    prepared to argue that if it pleases the Court.
                                                      I don't
    know if Mr. Stout, or the only opposed motions counsel
5
6
    is here. We can do it at a later date or we can do it
7
    another day.
8
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: The truth is I don't know the
    status of Mr. Stout's --
9
10
                MR. CARPENTER: Your Honors, we will point
11
    out that 9 of the 10 are unopposed.
12
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: With respect
13
    to -- it seems to me we can give notice that we are
    going to hear it if there is opposition, take care of
14
    the rest, and then give notice, okay, we will hear it
15
16
    next time in the door. And if one of you say, well, we
    would like to hear it before July 18th, otherwise we'll
17
    just indicate today informally, we will hear any
18
19
    opposition on that date and set it at the back end of
20
    the agenda?
21
                MR. ZIMMERMAN:
                                 Yeah.
22
                            I think nine of the ten are
                MR. PRATT:
23
    unopposed.
24
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: They are.
25
                MR. PRATT: We would ask that those be
```

entered if there is opposition, then we can set the schedule to deal with that.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right, that is what we'll -- we'll set, assuming -- I think that is the correct number. We will set it for July 18th at the end of the agenda, unless there is some agreement reached or we hear otherwise.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: And just so everybody understands, we as a Plaintiffs Steering Committee accept the notion that failure to comply with Plaintiff fact sheets can be dealt with of dismissal of the case for noncompliance.

On the other hand, we don't want anybody to lose, have a case dismissed, for failure to understand that they have to do something and be on notice that they haven't done that which they are required to do.

We will take it -- we have taken it upon ourselves as a Plaintiffs Steering Committee to reach out, notify people, let them know of the potential consequence. We think that on July 18th, with regard to these nine people, if they aren't in compliance, we understand those cases will be dismissed. We would ask that that be moved to that July 18th date.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: I think those are -- there is no opposition now to those nine. It us

just the one --

MR. ZIMMERMAN: It is just the one that is opposed, that is correct. If they haven't been opposed, we are not trying to make an opposition where one doesn't exist.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: It should be noted briefly that these are dismissals with prejudice, not without.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And obviously, the lawyers in the room know that there is more than a small significance to that. They are with prejudice.

That is the way it has been set up and noticed. In any event --

MR. ZIMMERMAN: And we understand that, as well, and we have communicated that, as well.

That brings us then to the second group, which is a joint proposed schedule for the hearing and argument and briefing on that. We had provided in Exhibit A, a schedule for the setting up of the next round of those potential compliance or dismissals. And it provides that Defendants -- that Plaintiffs' response to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss shall be filed on or before June 30, 2006. Defendant's replies by July 7, 2006, and then the Court will hear argument, it says, at

```
1
    the next July status. You may want to move that to the
2
    August status depending on the scheduling of the --
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: It will be fine.
 3
4
    We will set the -- July 18th, we will firm the date up,
    but I think that will be fine.
5
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: And as I sit here today, I
6
7
    don't know how many are within that second group, but
    Andy, I am sure you know off the top of your head.
8
                MR. CARPENTER: Actually, there is just one.
9
10
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: Just one. We are doing good
    here, Judge, we are doing good.
11
12
                Proposed joint stipulations, this has to do
13
    with one very minor matter, which is B, which is a word
    count. Apparently there is a stipulation to exceed the
14
    number of words, is that correct?
15
16
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK:
                                             That is fine.
17
                THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN:
                                                         Minor
18
    in their opinion?
19
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: Not so fast.
20
                THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN:
                                                         Minor
    in whose opinion?
21
22
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: I've got to read
23
    this --
24
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: Somebody has to read this
25
    crap.
```

1 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: We would never 2 characterize anything counsel is doing -- what was that word you used again? 3 MR. ZIMMERMAN: These words of endearment and 4 enlightenment, these words, 12,000 words of 5 6 enlightenment. Apparently we were asking for more. 7 the parties request leave from this word limit to file 8 briefs that -- do we have a word -- did we agree on a word limit? 9 10 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: I did note. 11 Conspicuous by its absence, it is not how much more? 12 MR. ZIMMERMAN: I would say 22 words more. 13 Then the second issue, Your Honor, is the response with regard to the Master Complaint. 14 15 We spent some time discussing this in 16 chambers. I think probably it would be helpful to maybe 17 go on the record and explain it very briefly, if you 18 would like. The Master Complaint does name Boston Scientific. 19 20 The Complaints that were filed prior to the 21 merger, or the acquisition, or the whatever by Boston 22 Scientific of Guidant, Boston Scientific was not named 23 in those Complaints. 24 With regard to the Master Complaint, that we 25 have agreed by stipulation there would be -- which is

1 the stipulation contained in Exhibit B, is there would 2 be an answer -- how are we agreed? There would be an 3 answer -- not filing an answer, but you do not waive any 4 defenses. Is that correct? That is right. 5 MR. CARPENTER: MR. ZIMMERMAN: And frankly, I don't know why 6 7 we would agree to that. Did we? 8 MR. LESSER: Paragraph C, it really works off 9 of paragraph C. 10 MR. PRATT: It is really not as complicated as it sounds. The deal is, Boston Scientific has not 11 12 being added officially as a named Defendant in the 13 Master Complaint. We have told the Plaintiffs Steering 14 15 Committee we will not agree to the addition of Boston 16 Scientific as a Defendant, because they have been named 17 as a Defendant but not added. The agreement is that we 18 don't need to respond on behalf of Boston Scientific by the deadline of June 26th. They are not a party. 19 20 don't need to respond. 21 Plaintiffs Steering Committee says they are 22 going to amend to add Boston Scientific as a Defendant. 23 That has not been done. When that is done, we will 24 respond appropriately and deal with it then. 25 THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: Т

```
assume the motion to amend to add Boston Scientific will
1
2
    be done in a fairly timely fashion so we can tee this up
    and get it resolved one way or the other?
3
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yeah.
                                        And I think that is
 4
    why I was confused about the stipulation. I didn't
5
6
    really understand the nuance. But, what is said is
7
    accurate as Tim has just portrayed it. And then we will
    move to add Boston Scientific as a Defendant to the
8
    Master Amended Complaint, formally, and to the prior
9
                 The Court will hear it.
10
    Complaints.
                                           There will be
                 We will brief it and it will be resolved on
11
    opposition.
    its merits.
12
13
                THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN:
                                                         Can
14
    we do that at the same time the preemption motion is
15
    considered?
16
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: They are in it, but they are
17
    saying they are not appropriately in it without an
18
    amendment.
                THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN:
19
                                                         Well,
20
    there has to be a motion to amend to add Boston.
                             Well, it would not be true for
21
                MR. LESSER:
22
    some of our Plaintiffs whose first Complaint in this
23
    litigation --
24
                THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN:
                                                         No,
25
    but apparently there are a lot of Complaints out there
```

that didn't have Boston Scientific. There has got to be a motion to amend Boston. All they are saying is that, make the motion. We will look at it. If we want to agree, we will. If we don't want to agree, we will put in a response and the Court will decide it.

I guess my only question is, is there any reason that it can't be considered at the same time as that preemption motion since we already talked about that kind of scheduling -- I mean --

MR. ZIMMERMAN: It probably makes sense, Your
Honor.

MR. LESSER: I don't see a reason why we couldn't. I just want it to be very clear that Boston Scientific is a named party in the Master Complaint.

And the agreement is that there need not be an answer at the present time on behalf of Boston Scientific to their inclusion as a party in the Master Complaint.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: But, I think that almost begs the question, because they are named in the Master Complaint, but they are not a party in some of the earlier complaints, so we have got to get it kind of cleaned up.

MR. LESSER: That is what we are trying to do. And we will try to work, I believe it is fair to say, towards having it heard at the same time --

```
1
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: We can hear both.
2
                MR. PRATT: We will work it out.
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: We will work it out. Because
3
4
    of the merger, it has created this disconnect. We will
    clean it up. It is not completely cleaned up yet, but
5
    at least there is a stipulation that they don't have to
6
7
    answer the Master until it is cleaned up.
8
                THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: It is
    a house cleaning matter, but it may be an important
9
10
    matter for the Defense. We will wait and see whether or
    not it is.
11
12
                The scheduling of the next telephone
13
    conference call?
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: July -- how about
14
15
    July 5th?
16
                THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN:
    the day after the July 4th. Is that a date both of
17
18
    you --
19
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: At eight in the morning, Your
20
    Honor? Come on.
21
                THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN:
                                                         Wе
22
    can change that.
23
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: How about July 6th?
24
    eight?
25
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, I would
```

```
rather have eight, because I think I will be in trial
1
2
    that week, so if it is at eight, it's not --
 3
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: There is just a lot of people
4
    travelling --
                THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN:
 5
    you going to be in court the day after the 4th of July?
6
7
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, no -- well,
    yes. But, eight, either day, we will make work.
8
9
                (Discussion off the record.)
10
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK:
                                            The Defense side
    of things, Plaintiffs' side of things? July 6th at 8:00
11
12
    a.m.?
13
                THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN:
    me ask this, in reference to this two-week conference,
14
    is there anything on anybody's radar screen? Do you
15
    think we are going to need a conference in two weeks?
16
17
    mean, this could be the middle of summer, July 4th
18
    weekend, where everybody says, hey, guess what, Judge,
19
    we don't have to see you until July 18th, because there
20
    is nothing burning that we need to talk to you about.
21
    I mean, there is always that possibility, isn't there?
22
                                 Always, hope breeds eternal.
                MR. ZIMMERMAN:
23
                MR. LESSER: Hopefully, we would let you know
24
    in advance, I do think there are some things that might
25
    be boiling up that we don't manage in our meet and
```

confer. And even if it only takes 10 or 15 minutes, it is worthwhile to have it.

2.0

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: All right.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: So, the schedule, then, as I understand it is July 6th at 8:00 a.m., the call in; and July 18th.

everybody is a Tuesday, not a Wednesday, because of mostly Judge Boylan's and my schedule. Tuesday, here in Minneapolis, July 18th. The same regimen, 8:00 for the meeting with counsel, 9:15 -- the difference, we are going to tee up these -- make sure we have got the motion, the opposition to any motion to dismiss. And if we don't have any other -- any other issues resolved and something is ready to be argued, because these motions now are coming in with responses, we can see where we are at with that, well in advance of the hearing, and say we will hear that at the same time, as well.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: That is fine, Your Honor.

And the only other date that we sort of set is this

hearing on the preemption, which we will reach later.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: We will figure that out. I think the main issue there is I can accommodate almost any time, as long as there is enough

1 time in between for us to prep for the hearing. 2 real issue I think for respective counsel is, do you want it on the same day as the status conference 3 following the briefing, or do you want it on a separate 4 date, because we can probably make either work, so --5 MR. ZIMMERMAN: And we will talk that out and 6 7 call in on making that --8 MR. LESSER: In that regard, Your Honor, if 9 it ended up being, for instance, the same day as the 10 status conference, the next status conference at 9:15 would probably be the following week. And I guess we 11 12 would probably want to know whether a week's time with 13 the papers would be enough for the Court. 14 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, we have --15 that is a push. 16 MR. LESSER: That is why I asked. THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: 17 Because that, 18 ordinarily, would be a push. And I think it is safe to 19 assume it would be here, because that would probably --20 yes, it would be. That is how it would fall. 21 MR. LESSER: 22 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: So, then the real 23 issue would be to go into either October or an earlier 24 date prior to that. Yeah, I think we should just assume

that the next status conference with a week downtime is

25

```
1
    not going to do it.
2
                             That is why I asked.
                MR. LESSER:
 3
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: So, we will do
4
    it sometime early October?
                THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN:
 5
    mean, if the briefing is done on the 15th, there is no
6
7
    way that that is going to be ready for a hearing on the
    following Wednesday. The 20th, by the way, Wednesday?
8
                MR. LESSER:
9
                             Yes.
10
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: So then the issue
    would be October.
11
12
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: Do you want to set a date
13
    now?
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK:
14
                                            Then the issue
    is, if you want to have it on the date -- in the October
15
16
    date, or unless you want it earlier, that October day
    would be Wednesday the 18th.
17
18
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: Why don't you just set a date
19
    early in October for the motion to amend, but primarily
20
    the preemption, and not mix it up with the status.
                                                         Ιt
21
    will get everyone -- you know, we have enough issues
22
    with those two, I think, to come before the Court.
23
                THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN:
                                                         And
24
    actually, that is not going to be before me, it will
25
    just be before Judge Frank. So, there is no reason for
```

```
1
    two of us to be here, so I agree with that assessment.
2
    It makes sense to have Mr. Lindquist give you a date.
 3
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: He will give you
4
    a date. We will get a date sometime in early to
    mid-October, prior to the 18th.
5
                MR. PRATT: Yes, I would -- I would suggest
6
7
    closer to the middle than the early part. I mean, I
    have got the Texas trial set for the middle of
8
9
    September, so I may be captive until the middle of
10
    October.
11
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: I have a wedding I have to
12
    attend on October 8th.
13
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: So, are you -- is
14
    Mr. Pratt making any -- are you making predictions on
    the trial proceeding as scheduled in October?
15
16
                MR. PRATT: If it involves Texas, Your Honor,
17
    I make no predictions.
18
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Okay, I will
19
    first start with lead counsel and go to any lawyers in
20
    the audience. Anything further on behalf of Plaintiffs?
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: Not from Lead Counsel, Your
21
22
    Honor.
            Thank you.
23
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Mr. Pratt and
24
    co-counsel?
25
                MR. PRATT: Nothing, Your Honor.
```

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Is there any respective counsel in the audience, regardless in what capacity you are here on -- unless you are here for the criminal cases this afternoon, I am not going to hear you out now during the Guidant matter, but anybody have anything further at this time? We will try to keep everything on the web. I think everything is essentially on schedule.

2.0

Since it is now clear that we will set up a date somewhere in the area of mid-October for the presumption argument, and more than likely put on the motion to amend, unless it is resolved, I will be hearing -- I will hear those together, if need be. As soon as that date is set, which will probably be soon, if not today, the next couple of days once counsel look at their schedules, we will get a date and we will get that up on the website. Because it looks like it will not be on the third Wednesday in October. Maybe that is the prudent thing to do.

Unless there is anything further, I will thank everybody for their attendance. And I think we might have a couple sidebars here with a couple of the Plaintiffs' lawyers. But, other than that, we are adjourned and thank you very much.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: The

1	sidebars have nothing to do with Guidant.
2	(Adjournment.)
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	Certified by:
8	Jeanne M. Anderson, RMR-RPR Official Court Reporter
9	
10	
11	
12	
13 14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	